

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

Vol. 67.—No. 24.]

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 13TH, 1829.

[Price 7d.]



"I hope the nation has ceased to look for any advantage from any change of administration. We must look no more to parties, and be assured that we never can expect any measures really useful, until the people of England have their proper share in the constitution of their country."—BURDETT'S SPEECH AT A MEETING AT WESTMINSTER, 30TH MARCH, 1809.

"I would fain hope, that the example given by the people of Westminster, might encourage other places still to contend for that small portion of independence which still remains in the country; and thereby keep alive, at least in the remembrance of their countrymen, their ancient right to a full, fair, and free representation of the people in Parliament, the only security for their rights and property against the despotism and plunder of the few. For these purposes you shall always find me ready to lay down my life."—BURDETT'S LETTER TO THE ELECTORS OF WESTMINSTER, 16TH OCT., 1812.

TO THE ELECTORS OF WESTMINSTER.

On the Motion for Parliamentary Reform, made by the MARQUIS OF BLANDFORD; and on the conduct of BURDETT and SANCHE, relative to that Motion.

Barn-Elm Farm, 9th June, 1829.

GENTLEMEN,

THERE are, at this moment, three important subjects which press forward for the consideration of the people, and which have all been subjects of discussion in the two Houses of Parliament: these are, first, the SUBJECT of PARLIAMENTARY REFORM; second, the attempt to expose our DEAD BODIES TO SALE; and third, the discussion on the BIRMINGHAM PETITION, relative to the money affairs. It is hard to say which is the most important of these three sub-

jects: if the Collective can authorise our dead bodies to be sold, there is no question that they have a right to order our live bodies to be sold; and whenever they pass a law to effect the former, I, for my part, disavow all allegiance to this country; and after that I will quit it as soon as I can; I will never live any longer than I cannot avoid it in a country, where there exists a governing power claiming a right of disposing of my body at its pleasure, whether that body be dead or alive. With regard to the money affair, it is the all and the every thing; because it depends upon the events connected with that, whether there shall exist the means of getting together a parcel of people ready to sell our bodies. We may pray and labour for Parliamentary Reform as long as we please; but never shall we get it, until the paper-money system be blown to atoms. Yet it is right to discuss this question of Parliamentary Reform: it is right to insist upon the principle: it is right to propose the measure and to urge it: it is a right to be contended for; and, indeed, the measure is absolutely necessary in order to the making of that equitable adjustment, without which there must be confusion and revolution. I have always contended, and I still contend, that there can be, and that there ought to be, no reduction of the interest of the debt, except with the consent of a reformed Parliament. When I proposed an amendment to the petition of the county of Kent in 1822, I distinctly stated, that no reduction ought ever to take place, until a reform of the Parliament had taken place. The motion which I made upon that occasion was this: that there be added to the words of the petition, as it now stands, the following words: "*and your petitioners further humbly pray, that, as soon as your Honourable House have completed a reform of your Honourable House, you will be pleased to make a JUST reduction of the interest of the National Debt.*" That

was my motion ; these words were added to the petition ; the petition was agreed to almost unanimously, was presented to the Parliament, where it now lies on the table, making part of a mass of rejected prayers, surpassing any other such mass that was ever heard of in the world. In the month of January succeeding that I had the honour (one that I would not exchange for all the stars and ribbons of Wellington) to propose to the county of NORFOLK, that sensible and spirited county, the petition which now bears its name, and which (mark the prediction!) will be recorded in history as the basis of an ADJUSTMENT, which will rescue this now degraded nation from the hands of Jews, jobbers, and borough-mongers. In that petition, which now lies upon the table of the House, we prayed, that the Parliament *might be reformed* ; and that, *then*, and not before, a deduction might be made from the interest of the National Debt ; praying, at the same time, that all sinecures, all unmerited pensions, and all grants of Crown lands, and grants of money, might be put an end to ; and that a part of the property, commonly called church property, might be disposed of, and applied to a liquidation of the Debt.

For my part, therefore, I have no notion of any change for the better, until a reform of the Parliament shall have been effected. I am convinced that this will not be effected as long as the paper fabric can be made to hold together. This, however, cannot now be long : there is every symptom of a total breaking up ; there is every appearance of the system drawing to an end ; and, therefore, it is good that we discuss, without loss of time, this question of Reform ; that we ascertain beforehand, who are with us and who are against us. I was, therefore, exceedingly delighted to hear LORD WINCHILSEA talk of the necessity of Parliamentary Reform ; but I am still more delighted at seeing the subject brought forward by the MARQUIS of BLANDFORD ; and that, too, with so much ability, and with so evident a resolution to push the subject on, and to *put the skulking patriots to the test*. The subject was brought forward by the

MARQUIS of BLANDFORD on Tuesday, the 2d of this month of June, in a speech which concluded with the following two resolutions :—

“ 1. That there exists a class or description of Boroughs, commonly called “ close or decayed, in which the returns “ of members to Parliament are notoriously capable of being effected by the “ payment of money in the way of purchase, and frequently are so effected ; “ and also another class of Boroughs, in “ which the elective franchise is vested “ in so few electors, that the returns are “ capable of being effected by the payment of money, in the way of bribes, “ to individual electors, and frequently “ are so effected.—2. That the existence of such Boroughs, and the continuance of such practices, are disgraceful to the character of this House, “ destructive of the confidence of the “ people, and prejudicial to the best “ interests of the country.”

These resolutions were finally put to the vote, and both of them *negatived* ; that is to say, declared to be *false* ; the second resolution was negatived without a division ; but the noble MARQUIS had the cleverness and the courage to put the Collective to the test upon the first, and it actually voted 114 to 40, that the first resolution *was false* ! But, before I go further, I will insert the speech of the MARQUIS of BLANDFORD entire as I find it in the Morning Chronicle. I shall also notice what was said by little SANCHEO, and by that TRUEZ man, PEEL.

The Marquis of BLANDFORD, in rising to move certain Resolutions on the subject of Parliamentary Reform, addressed the Speaker to the following effect :—In pursuance, Sir, of the notice which I have given to move this day certain Resolutions upon the subject of Reform in the system of our representation, I rise now to state and explain the specific grounds upon which I am prepared to argue its propriety ; and in so doing, I feel it necessary to request the indulgence of Hon. Members, assuring them, that if, in the course of my observations, I advert to a subject, further discussion on which I am sensible is unpalatable to a greater part of this House, I shall do so as tenderly as I may be able, and I shall urge it merely as a reason to induce those who, like myself, may apprehend mischief from the introduction of a new party in this House, to embrace my views and to acquiesce

in the Resolutions I intend to move. But Hon. Members, I am persuaded, will also feel my peculiar situation, and will admit, that having originally rested the expediency of this measure upon special grounds, I cannot with consistency now cast them wholly aside, and proceed at once to the consideration of it upon grounds new and general; and no sincere friend of reform will, I trust, be disposed to quarrel with me, or to refuse his support to my Resolutions, if now, avowing and ready to act upon an enlarged and more liberal view of the whole question, I still am consistent with myself, and press the consideration of a danger clearly not impossible. I do, however, assure the House that, upon either view of the question, I will circumscribe my remarks to the utmost of my power, and will not trespass long upon the attention they may indulge me with; and first, Sir, I would observe, that in courtesy to former advocates of the measure, I would willingly have left it in their hands, for it seems right and reasonable that those who have argued so powerfully against decayed boroughs and proprietary influence should go on with their own work; but as they seem to have declined the *patriotic undertaking*, the conviction I feel of its pressing necessity is too powerful for me to heed the charge of temerity in thus presuming to succeed to their office. *We shall now see who are the declaimers, and who the doers, in the work of Parliamentary regeneration; we shall now see who are true and steady to their purposes, and who would wish to give those purposes a long adjournment; it will now be seen who are strenuous in their wishes to purify Parliament, and protect the great interests of the country.* The question has been now for some time laid upon the shelf; the bills and draughts of bills which have been prepared are now, from long neglect, covered with dust, and buried in oblivion. Honourable Gentlemen, the former friends and advocates of the measure, may, if they please, bestow upon Ministers the compliment of their silence, but I do not feel disposed to imitate their courtesy. Every day's experience proves the necessity of some measure of this sort. The country expects, I may say demands, some statutory provision for the safety of its interests; the interests of its agriculture, its trade, its manufactures, its finance, and especially the interests of the Protestant community, against the influx and increase of the Roman Catholic party. The whole internal constitution of this House has been revolutionized. This new state of things requires new enactments. An imperious necessity has been superadded to the already existing propriety of putting down the *borough-monger and his trade*; our rights and our liberties are in jeopardy as long as majorities in this House are to be obtained *by buying seats and selling services*; and though I may fail on this occasion in establishing upon the minds of a majority of this House a conviction of this truth, I shall persevere in my

efforts to expose the corruption, and proclaim the danger of these practices. Sir, it may perhaps be thought that the magnitude of this question, and the splendid eloquence of its former advocates should have deterred me from rashly embarking upon the consideration of it. But though I may despair of doing it justice, I feel its importance, or rather its necessity, too strongly to leave the thing unattempted through a consciousness of inability; and in asserting and advocating my own peculiar views of it, I am fully prepared for the imputation that those views are erroneous—that my fears are groundless—and that the measures and means of reform which I would propose are neither called for by the exigency of the times, nor by the existence of any real danger from the projects of the Roman Catholic body. I speak of that body, Sir, as a large political party in the State. I speak not of individuals; of individuals of that body I would say that there is no one in this House more ready than I am to admit their honour and integrity; but I am speaking of a large class and denomination of individuals; a large and powerful political party of six or seven millions of men; a party acknowledging a common head and centre of union, a spiritual Sovereign, and that Sovereign residing in a foreign country. In such a state of things, and under such an intermixture of foreign and domestic relations, I shall continue to think that it is the part of prudence to prevent the accumulation of Roman Catholic power in this House. Those who may be disposed to ridicule these opinions are liable to be told that they are as ignorant of human nature and the workings of party spirit as they are of the energies of the Romish Church. As soon as gentlemen of that persuasion enter this House, they will be found to form a party. That party will be considered by the Roman Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland as their real representatives; as the special defenders of their rights, the vindicators of their wrongs, the promoters of their wishes and their hopes. This Roman Catholic party, like all other parties, both in and out of this House, will be desirous of increasing its political strength; and looking to the energy of that body, its union of purpose, and extensive co-operation, I am convinced that they will enter the borough market *with better chances and larger means of purchase than any of their competitors.* Seats in this House will be bought up by the agents of this wealthy, powerful, and enterprising body, and thus to their county strength in Ireland will be added their burghage tenure strength in this country; and their whole number of Representatives will present a well-ordered and compact phalanx, animated by one spirit, and impelled to the same measures by the same motives and purposes. Let it not be thought, Sir, that I am disposed to contend that any immediate danger is to be apprehended from the magnitude of their numbers in this House (though if the reports which

circulate be true, it would appear that the system which I am foretelling has already made a beginning). But I do contend, that we are not bound to wait till danger threatens. I do contend that it is the part of prudence to devise the means of prevention and defence; and I do insist that those means are justifiable in the prospect of a possibility of danger. But I will not dwell longer upon this topic. I feel I owe apologies to the House for having dilated at such length upon it, and I will now proceed to a far more important and interesting division of my subject, and I do so under feelings of less embarrassment and greater confidence than those I have experienced while endeavouring to enforce the view already presented. I cannot but entertain a reasonable hope that a large portion of the Members of this House will be disposed to agree with me upon the general principles, even though they should not be of opinion that I have made out any case for the necessity of Reform, by the special grounds I have taken. If, Sir, in the days of Locke, and still later in the days of Blackstone, this measure were deemed expedient (and I appeal to both these writers for support upon this point), subsequent events, and increased and increasing evils, make the measure now a measure of necessity and not of expediency. It is no longer to be tolerated that the best interests of the country, and the dearest rights of the subject, and I will add, the most valuable privileges of this House, are to be *compromised and endangered by borough contractors, and sellers of seats in Parliament*. But let Honourable Members listen to the words of Locke himself upon this question.—

“It being the interest as well as the intention of the people to have a fair and equal representation, whoever brings it nearest to that is an undoubted friend to, and establisher of, the Government, and cannot miss the consent and approbation of the community;” and again he says—“It is not a change from the present state, which, perhaps, corruption or decay has introduced, that makes an inroad upon the Government, but the tendency of it to injure or oppress the people, and to set up one part, or party, with a distinction from, and an unequal subjection of the rest. Whatsoever cannot but be acknowledged to be of advantage to the society, and people in general, upon just and lasting measures, will always, when done, justify itself; and whenever the people shall choose their representatives upon just and undeniably equal measures, suitable to the original frame of the Government, it cannot be doubted to be the will and act of the society, whoever permitted or caused them to do so.” But, Sir, I will not now enter upon any wide survey of this question—I will not now touch upon the nature of suffrage, nor will I seek to determine the principle by which the right of voting should be regulated; neither will I enter further upon what has been called the Philosophy of Representation, nor attempt by statistical calculations to settle how many

Members should be returned by the landed, how many by the moneyed, or how many by the trading interest. Plans for the speedier returns of Members upon new elections, and for the limitation of the duration of Parliament, shall form no part of my present purpose. I will confine myself to matters much more simple in themselves, and consequently more easy for statement. My wish, Sir, is to witness the extinction of close and decayed boroughs, and to transfer their Representations (as it may be settled hereafter) to other places; to what places, towns, or counties, and in what measure and proportion to each, must be left to be considered in Committee. But the extinction of these proprietary seats, this burghage tenure influence, is called for by the injuries and mischiefs it inflicts on the country. Can there be any thing more monstrous, Sir, than *that seven electors, headed by the parish constable* (I allude to Gatton) *should send two Honourable Members to this House, and that two more should represent the interesting ruins and well-peopled sheep-folds of Sarum*? What reason can we discover in the nature of things or in the principles of representation, why some Honourable Members in this House should have neither houses nor inhabitants to represent—why others should only represent individuals—why there should be so many whose constituents *do not exceed ten*? Can there, Sir, be anything, in more open defiance of common sense and political expediency than that 354 voters should send 56 Members to Parliament (a ninth part of the whole House of Commons)? What cause can be found either in the mineral or the agricultural wealth of Cornwall that it should be so prolific of Honourable Members in this House, although all the population of all the Cornish boroughs is not much greater than that of Nottingham alone? And, Sir, it must remain a subject of alarm to many, of surprise to all, that, according to a calculation taken in 1815, one-half of the English and Welsh Representatives in this House should be returned by about 11,000 persons, and the other half by above nine millions. Sir, this is neither the time nor the place to enter into nice verifications of facts; it is sufficient to lay grounds for future inquiry, and I believe that it will then appear that I have understated the anomalies of our Representation. But, Sir, the answer given to all this is, “*it works well*”; this has been the ready reply since the time that the late Mr. Canning’s eloquence gave it currency, and made it popular. “*It works well*.” True, it does work very well for the jobbers in the borough-market; it does work very well for all who go on to power, and profit, and distinction by the system; and I dare say Ministers will be the last to say it works ill. But, Sir, it works destructively for the empire at large; it works destructively for the country and its colonies; it works against every one of the great interests of this country; against the well-being of its trade, its manufactures, its agriculture. Majorities, and (according

to my views of the questions which have been carried) fatal majorities in this House, have been swelled by means of this influence; and what is most mischievous is, the existence of such a system degrades this House in the estimation of the people; the Representative Body loses the respect and confidence of the Body represented. It is to this cause, Sir, that the indignation of the country ascribes the success of the odious principle of Free Trade; a principle which, if persisted in, will spread the desolation still further which so fearfully prevails, and is now pressing so severely on our commerce. To this again is to be attributed the largeness of that majority which lately overthrew the Constitution, and proved to the people how very little their prayers were heard or heeded. How then, Sir, is a system so mischievous to be amended? Which are the most pressing of its evils? Where should the proposed reform begin? Unquestionably in the extinction of decayed boroughs. Whether this should be effected by compensation, or without compensation, and whether we should extend our inquiries to self-elected Corporate Bodies, possessing the rights of franchise, will be matter for future discussion. But, Sir, vital interests are in the meanwhile at stake. The nation knows and feels it to be so; it feels it in all the ramifications of its commerce, in all the elements of its wealth and greatness; it feels it in the very husbandry of its soil, the staple of its power and prosperity; and it feels too, that it is not safe to trust to burgage tenures and proprietary influence, what should be confided to a chaster Representation. The disease, no doubt, is of long standing, but the seat of it has been well ascertained, and it will require no great skill in political anatomy to remove the parts affected: they cannot be cured; they must be cut away—

“Immedicabile vulnus
Ense recidendum, ne pars sincera trahatur.”

Entertaining, therefore, Sir, these sentiments, and impressed with a strong feeling, that in the existing circumstances of the country (which it would be idle for any man to seek to disguise from himself), it would be expedient for this House not to separate, without evincing some disposition to take this question into its consideration at no distant period, I have thought it my duty, at this eleventh hour, to direct the attention of Hon. Members to it; and I shall conclude my present observations by conjuring them to bear in mind the ever-memorable words of Mr. Burke, as cited by Mr. Fox—“Representation (not the unreal mockery, but the efficient substance of Representation) is the sovereign remedy for every disorder, the infallible security against popular discontent.”

The motion was seconded by Mr. O'NEIL; Mr. BENNETT, of Wiltshire, and Mr. HUME spoke shortly in favour of it. Then came PEEL, Member for

WESTBURY, son of the spinning-jenny Baronet, and he disapproved of the motion on account of the time in which it was brought forward. What this fellow said is curious; and therefore I will insert it as I find it in the above-mentioned paper.

Mr. PEEL felt bound to give the motion a negative. He admitted that the Noble Lord had stated the question with temper and ability; and the opposition he should give it did not in the slightest degree abate the satisfaction with which he heard the descendant of an illustrious warrior, and the representative of a noble house, vindicate his opinions with an ability worthy of the name he inherited. Considering the nature of the subject, all must agree that it ought not to be brought forward when there was *no time for deliberation*, when the House was thin, and when it would have no opportunity of following up the motion by any practical measure. He conceived that the Noble Lord rather moved the resolutions with a view to an understanding, that, in the next Session, he would renew the subject, and go into details. At the present period, when he believed that in two days the public business would enable the House to adjourn, could the Noble Lord expect that House to assent to resolutions which branded with disgrace a considerable portion of the Representative system of the country? The second resolution affirmed the small boroughs to be a disgrace to the House. If he could admit this, he should not attempt to persuade the House to such an unqualified condemnation, without following up that condemnation by some practical measure. But he was not prepared to allow that the small boroughs were a disgrace to the House. Many of the trustees of small boroughs exercised the trust reposed in them with honour to themselves, and advantage to the country. But if such boroughs were to be disfranchised, surely the House ought to be prepared with some plan by which such forfeited franchises were in future to be exercised. By negating the motion, the subject would not be lost; for a Noble Lord (Lord John Russell) had given notice of a motion for the next Session, that the towns of Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds, should be represented in that House. The House would be long before it condemned a part of the system by which it had often been enabled to overcome local prejudices. He was not sure that it was not by the aid of small boroughs, that the questions of Free Trade, and of Catholic Emancipation had been carried. It was hardly treating the subject with due consideration, to introduce it at such a period of the Session.

After PEEL came little SANCHE, who, if the report of the speech be correct, clearly shows to me that, in the first place, he was infernally enraged with

LORD BLANDFORD for bringing the motion forward; next, that he did all he could to throw cold water upon it, though he thought it prudent not absolutely to vote against it. The speech is one that might have done honour to the old DON himself: it is all *see-saw*: all up-and-down: all intended to do nothing for reform, to suffer, if possible, nothing to be done for it, and yet *appear to wish for it*. I beseech you, Gentlemen, to read this speech with particular attention; and to mark also what followed in the speech of PEELE and the *denial* of SANCHE; when I have inserted these speeches, just as I find them in *The Morning Chronicle*, I shall proceed to make some remark upon the divers parts of the transaction.

Mr. J. C. HOBHOUSE said, that if he thought the introduction of any reform would make the House less inclined to the grant of *religious liberty* to his country, *he would rather that the House should remain as it was*. His conviction was the contrary. When the Right Honourable Gentleman opposite had introduced the Catholic Relief Bill, he had boldly stated, that it was his firm conviction, that the majority of the popular parts of the representation were decidedly inclined towards Catholic Emancipation. For the principles of free trade he (Mr. Hobhouse) had always been an advocate, only thinking that it had not been carried far enough, and only lamenting that it had not been introduced sooner. If he thought the people of England so completely obtuse, and so thoroughly incapable of receiving the truth, *as to reject the doctrines of free trade*, then he should say that *he would sooner accept of such a portion of the intelligence of the country as they already had in that House*, than to refer to those who were so completely ignorant of their duty and of their best interests. *Whoever* the Noble Lord might have referred to, when he *spoke of the person who had deserted the post of Parliamentary Reform*, he (Mr. Hobhouse) would say, that as long as he had a seat in that House, he should not be found wanting in any crisis, or on any occasion, to support that question. He would be the last man to inquire *into what were the motives of him who brought the question forward*, but he should give it his firm and zealous support. The Noble Lord had urged many of those topics which, by frequent repetition, had become tedious; but it was only by their being so proved that they had arrived at that point at which it was impossible any longer to contradict them. He would congratulate the House and the country upon the change in the language of Government upon this subject. The

time had been when, if a single finger had been stirred in the cause of Parliamentary Reform, the question was sure to be put down by the most decisive and uncompromising of all negatives. The eloquent predecessor of the Right Honourable Secretary, in his place in that House had said, that in *whatever shape the question of Reform were proposed, it should find in him a determined and uncompromising opponent*. It was not so upon the present occasion. The first objection of the Right Honourable Gentleman to the motion was, that the time of the Session was not convenient for the House to entertain a subject of such magnitude. Mr. Canning, on the contrary, always endeavoured to treat the question as one of total insignificance; a question too insignificant to render it of any consequence whether it were introduced at the beginning, in the middle, or at the end of the Session. If the House was thin, he said it was so much the better, for it the better held up the subject and its supporters to the ridicule of the country. For the question of Parliamentary Reform, he (Mr. Hobhouse) should say that the present was a full House. It was a full House for any question, considering the manner in which Members had attended to subjects at the latter part of the Session. Indeed it was difficult to get a fuller attendance at any period of the Session. The Right Honourable Gentleman had next objected to the motion because the Noble Lord had not proposed a remedy for the evils which the motion went to condemn. But the Noble Lord only asked for an inquiry, and had said, if you grant an inquiry, I will tell you of the remedy. It was not necessary that the Noble Lord should enter into details before he had stated what was his object. But what was the general proposition to which the opposition of the Right Hon. Gentleman amounted, namely, that evils were not to be ascertained, because as yet no perfect remedy had been devised. If the Noble Lord's proposition was carried into effect, he would have an easy task to propose, that certain boroughs should be discontinued from returning members; and after that, as the Noble Lord had justly said, it would be for the House to determine how their franchises should be disposed of. Upon this point he had hopes of the Right Honourable Gentleman's support. The Right Honourable Secretary opposite, whose powerful advocacy had been exerted upon various occasions, had ever been himself a decided opponent to Parliamentary Reform; he had, indeed, objected, not to the principle, but to the time and mode of introducing it. He (Mr. Hobhouse) confessed that he was one of those *wild reformers* adverted to by the Honourable Member for Wiltshire, who were anxious to introduce that wild reform so much condemned by him (hear, hear!) *He wished the most wide and extended reform*, but he was not prepared to refuse the most narrow and limited reform; he should feel thankful for any thing which he could obtain, without, however, ab-

gaining from a perseverance in seeking all that he wished. He did not deny that it would be *better to allow seats to be openly sold*, rather than have them disposed of by the secret and more circuitous application of money. How, for instance, could a man of limited means contend for the representation of a county where he must run the risk of an expenditure of 30,000*l.* or 40,000*l.* without any thing like a certainty of success? He would take an instance, that of Mr. Ricardo, *one of the ablest Members who had sat in that House*. That Honourable Member, in obtaining his borough, had set aside a certain sum of money, *which would have secured his seat during his life*. The Hon. Member concluded by showing, that if the motion of the Noble Marquis stopped short with getting rid of the small boroughs, without a more general reform, *he feared he should be unable to support it*.

Mr. Secretary PEEL, in explanation, said, that he had abstained from entering into the details of the question, because he did not think the House entertained an appetite for it. He must, however, observe, that the Honourable Member for Westminster *had furnished the most triumphant argument in favour of small boroughs*, in his allusion to the return of Mr. Ricardo, than whom a more *able*, a more *enlightened*, or *upright* man had not sat in that House. (*Hear, hear!*) Indeed upon the whole, he thought *he had reason to claim the Hon. Member for Westminster as a convert to his principles*, than that he (Mr. Peel) had turned round and embraced his (Mr. Hobhouse's).

Mr. HOBHOUSE denied that he had advocated the continuance of small boroughs; all he said was, that *so long as the present system existed, he should wish them to continue*.

The Marquis of BLANDFORD, in reply, contended, that inquiry was of no use, unless the House determined to purify itself, and do away with public grievances.

The House then divided—

For the Motion 40

Against it 114

Majority . . . —74

In remarking upon this transaction, which, all taken together, is one amongst the most curious which we have witnessed for a long while, I shall begin with PEEL; and after that, come to SANCHE and the DON, the last of whom had, it seems, the prudence to hold his tongue. The conduct of PEEL might be called that of madness, were we not in the daily habit of witnessing things of the like sort. Here is before the House a proposition stating, that *"there are in this kingdom a description of boroughs called close, or decayed, to obtain seats for which boroughs money is frequently given;*

"and that there is another class of boroughs, in which the electors are so few in number, that, in these also, seats sometimes are obtained by the payment of money." This proposition, the facts here stated, are **NOTORIOUSLY TRUE**; all the world know them to be true; and yet PEEL, resolving, apparently, to offer the MARQUIS as great an affront as possible, opposes the proposition *by a direct negative*. Before I go further, let me insert some remarks from the STANDARD NEWSPAPER, two days after the debate took place.—
"In our allusion to Tuesday's discussion we advisedly, and from an earnest desire not to withdraw attention from the Marquis of Blandford's noble speech, abstained from adverting to some subordinate circumstances of the debate, which deserve, however, to be recorded, as they are connected with an event of the highest interest and importance; for such we hold to be the motion of the patriot nobleman, and the monstrous resolution by which it was met. That resolution has indeed amazed every man, well as the public were prepared for any manifestation on the part of the House of Commons. The motives which induced Mr. Peel to call for a negative resolution as to facts, affirmed and argued upon in his speech; the feelings which determined Mr. Hobhouse to speak against a motion in favour of which he was afraid not to vote, would seem inscrutable, had we not full experience that, as strong passions will obscure the judgment of the wise, petty jealousies and paltry spites make the perplexities and pitfalls of the small. When the Marquis of Blandford proposed his resolution, Mr. Peel might, as we have before observed, have met it by the previous question, a mode of evasion which would have spared the House such an exhibition as it has made, and which would have this recommendation, that in Parliamentary usage it is considered the most courteous form in which to meet a motion in which it is deemed inconvenient to concur. For that very reason Mr. Peel took the opposite course; in his judgment, the

“ character in which the House of Commons might exhibit itself was of little moment, provided that the member for Westbury might put a slight upon the descendant of John, Duke of Marlborough. He, therefore, called upon the House to put a direct negative upon Lord Blandford’s resolution, the greatest affront which can be offered to a member within the forms of the House. Lord Blandford saw the motive, but he also saw the trap which the sagacious secretary had prepared for himself; with equal sagacity and spirit *he enclosed him in it*. The Noble Marquis declared that he would divide the House upon the first resolution, thus placing it under the necessity of adopting the principle of his motion, or of declaring and recording, with *all solemnity*, that *no such places as Westbury, Gatton, Old Sarum*, are to be found in England. To this portentous negative the House agreed, and it is a proposition which for one eminent quality transcends any thing to be found in the history of any legislative body in any country.”

What PEEL expected was, that the Marquis *would not divide the House* upon this occasion; and there are, indeed, very few who would have divided the House under such circumstances; but the MARQUIS was one of those few; and there stands the Collective, there it stands before the face of the nation, having declared by solemn vote, *that there are no close or decayed boroughs, the seats for which may be obtained by money*; while it is notorious, that these seats are not only so obtained, but that such seats are frequently advertised for sale in the newspapers. The Collective could not have stood before the people in a more admirable light, if it had voted 114 to 40, that the sun makes his appearance by night and not by day. In 1811, it did vote that a one-pound note and a shilling were equal in value to a guinea; when, at that very time, the Government itself was purchasing guineas at from twenty-six to twenty-eight shillings each; yes, at the very time that the Treasury were purchasing guineas at this price, the lower Collective, at the

instigation of that same Government, voted, by a great majority, that a one-pound note and a shilling were as valuable as a guinea! On the 11th of May, 1809, Mr. MADDOCKS made the following declaration and motion in the House of Commons: “ I affirm then, that Mr. Dick purchased a seat in the House of Commons, for the borough of Cashel, through the agency of the Honourable HENRY WELLESLEY, who acted for, and on behalf of, the Treasury; that, upon a *recent question* of the last importance, when Mr. DICK had determined to vote according to his conscience, the Noble Lord, CASTLEREAGH, did intimate to that gentleman the necessity of either voting *with the Government*, or resigning *his seat in that House*; and that Mr. DICK, sooner than vote against principle, did make choice of the latter alternative, and vacate his seat accordingly. To this transaction I charge the Right Honourable Gentleman, Mr. PERCEVAL, as being privy and having connived at it. This I will engage to PROVE BY WITNESSES AT YOUR BAR, if the House will give me leave to call them;” and, accordingly, he made a motion for leave to call witnesses to the bar. The decision upon this motion was, *that the House would not hear any witnesses upon the subject*; that it *would not inquire*; and thus it solemnly decided by 395 votes against 85. In the course of this debate it was alleged, that the inquiry *ought not to take place*, because the practice of seat-selling was as *notorious as the sun at noon-day*! And yet that same house now votes, that there is no such thing as seat-selling in the kingdom: it votes thus on a division; and there are a hundred and fourteen men capable of asserting that there are no boroughs in England, the seats in which are to be obtained for money! If this House had declared in the words of THE STANDARD; and if the whole of the 114 Members had taken their solemn oaths, that no such places as WESTBURY, GATTON, OLD SARUM, RIEGATE, BLECHINGLEY, HAZLEMERE, and the like, of which there are more than a hundred;



if they had taken their solemn oaths, that no such places, that places *with no such names* existed in England, the assertion could not have been of a different character than that which it now is. If PEEL had taken his oath, that there was no BOROUGH called WESTBURY. the oath would not have surpassed this *negative*.

There we have Peel and the collective, exhibited in their own colours proceeding from their own brush; and now let us come to the two representatives of the RUMP, first taking the words of the Standard Newspaper, relative to the conduct of HOBHOUSE:—"The motives of the member for Westminster are as transparent, and about as minute as those of his worthy colleague of Westbury. Mr. Hobhouse has lost his only hold, even upon the rabble who have sent him to Parliament. It was only because hitherto no man pretending to the rank of a gentleman, save himself and the Baronet, could be found to connect themselves with Reform, that even the Westminster men endured such representatives. But now that Reform is taken up by a man of high rank, high talents, and spotless character, and upon unexceptionable grounds too, the Westminster members see that kindred spirits to his will be arrayed in the same cause, and that their occupation is gone. Mr. Hobhouse, therefore, feels towards Lord Blandford, as the quack feels towards the learned and honest practitioner whose prescription he may not venture to resist, though he hates him with his whole soul: he spoke against the motion, and voted for it, in the hope that his vote may be remembered after his speech shall have undergone the oblivion predestinated to all his eloquence: here, however, he will be disappointed; this speech shall be remembered and printed too, we doubt not, in letters of the full stature of the author, at the next Westminster election."

The STANDARD is not correct in saying that SANCHE was returned to Parliament by a *rabble*: it is not a rabble, but a *rump*. Nor is it correct to say,

that Burdett and Hobhouse have been returned because no person of the rank of a gentleman could be found to connect themselves with the cause of Reform. BURDETT was returned originally by the real people of Westminster, guided by me, and actuated by motives as pure as ever actuated any men in this world. When HOBHOUSE was taken in, that great city had been rendered, to all intents and purposes, a rotten borough in point of effect; and that, too, by a series of intrigues as disgraceful as any that ever marked the conduct and proceedings of a rotten borough. But, I agree with the Standard, that these fellows would long ago have been displaced, had there been any man of rank like LORD BLANDFORD, in whom the people could have reasonably confided; and it is, at once, the *interest* and the *duty* of such men to come forward, in every such case. In consequence of their not having done this, the people have been alienated from the nobility; and it requires now a very great effort to bring them back. More of this by and by, when I have fully exposed the conduct of BURDETT and HOBHOUSE, on this occasion.

Gentlemen, look at the mottoes; call to mind the numerous instances in which BURDETT insisted, that nothing but a reform in the Parliament would save this country from slavery, after its having been first reduced to beggary; and then look at his present conduct! In looking at the minority upon LORD BLANDFORD'S motion, we find BURDETT'S name not one of the *forty*. *He was in the House on the same evening* when the Marquis made his motion; and he presented a petition from Mr. HENRY BURGESS a little while before the motion was made. Notice had been given of the motion: he knew that it was coming on: therefore, while we are *not sure* that he did not vote in the *majority*; while we are *not sure* that he did not vote *against* his Lordship's motion, we are *sure* that he did *not vote for it*; and we are, therefore, *sure*, that he either voted against it, or that he got out of the way in order to avoid voting for it! And this is the man, gentlemen, that pledged himself to

us a hundred times over, that his whole life should be devoted in an endeavour to obtain us a reform! this is the man, of whom SANCHO, of the late "purity dinner," and under the protection of the well-crammed ruffians; this is the man of whom little SANCHO said, that the hope of reform "*lulled him upon his pillow,*" and on whose heart reform would be found engraven, after he was dead!

And now pray take a look at the speech of this HOBHOUSE, reported to have been made upon the present occasion. He begins by quarrelling with the reasons stated by the mover; and he finds out a contingency to state, which would induce him to oppose a reform in Parliament! This is what he says; that, if he thought that reform of Parliament would prevent what has been called an emancipation of the Catholics, and would prevent the system of free trade from being persevered in, *he would oppose Parliamentary Reform.* Now, the fact is, that a very great majority of the people, including the middle and lower orders of the Catholics themselves, were opposed to what he here miscalls *religious liberty*, which is, in fact, *disfranchisement of the poor for the benefit of the rich.* We are not to take the Catholic Belief Bill, as it is called, disconnected from the horrible act for disfranchising of the forty-shilling freeholders. We are to take them both together: taking them thus, every just man is opposed to them, and the great body of the Catholics more opposed to them than any body else; for they can see nothing that has been done for them, while a great and the best part of their civil liberties have been taken away. This is notoriously the general opinion of the people; and yet SANCHO says, that if *they be of this opinion, he would prevent them from having reform.*

"Free trade," too, that is to say, the utter ruin of innumerable tradesmen, manufacturers, and others, with a view of augmenting the receipts of the Custom House; he will have the people swallow this, or he will be opposed to reform! He knows that the people detest this system of *free trade*; and, therefore, he thus provides himself with an

excuse for opposing a reform of the Parliament. A very great majority of the country are against the system of *free trade*: it is not free trade, but it is a thing which goes by that name; the folly of it has been proved by the conduct of France and America. PEELE has recently represented the American TARIFF as being one cause of the present distress; and it certainly does augment that distress; and this Tariff we owe entirely to the system of what is called FREE TRADE. The French have, in consequence of this system, resolved to receive nothing from us; and they have stated most distinctly that our system has induced them to do this. It is notorious, that manufactures and trade in England are now under a process of decay that must end in general ruin, if not convulsion: they have come into this state under the operation of the system which this HOBHOUSE applauds; and yet this fellow says, that if he thought the people of England would reject the doctrine of FREE TRADE, he would suffer them to have nothing to do in the exercising of the right of choosing of Members of Parliament; he would suffer them to have no influence whatever in the making of laws. This is one way of speaking against reform and speaking against the motion of the MARQUIS: he supposes a case not to exist, which he knows does exist; and then he says, if that case existed, *I would oppose Parliamentary Reform!* All he says after this, in favour of the principle of reform, amounts to nothing; and when he finds fault with CANNING, for having said that he would oppose reform to the end of his life, he seems to forget that that declaration did not prevent him and BURDETT from supporting CANNING!

There is another way, and a very effectual way of working in opposition to reform; and that is, by declaring yourself to be a "*wild reformer,*" and that you would go *all manner of lengths*: this way, also, the little man tries; says that "*he is a wild reformer,*" and that he would go to the full extent in his demands of Reform. He says, however, that he is not prepared to *refuse* the most narrow and limited Reform. To show

how sincere he must be, look at the close of his speech, where he says that, unless the Marquis's Reform "be more general he fears he shall be UNABLE to support it!" So that, after having said, in one part of his speech, that he wished for the most wide and extended reform, but would not refuse the most narrow and limited, and "would be thankful for any thing he could obtain," in a few minutes after having said this, he said, "that if the noble MARQUIS stopped short with getting rid of the small boroughs, without a more general reform, he feared he should be unable to support him!" This is the result; this he sees he shall do; this provides him, as he thinks, with an excuse for opposing that motion of which the Marquis has given notice for the next session, in the following words:—"To move for a committee to inquire into the causes why the people are not represented in this house according to the spirit of the constitution?—or, to bring forward some specific measure to restore the purity of representation."

HOBHOUSE's grand attack, however, consisted in his *eulogium on the rotten boroughs*. The speech makes him say, that these rotten boroughs were attended with certain advantages; and he cited as an instance, that of RICARDO, who, he said, had laid by a certain sum of money to "secure a seat for himself during his life." He spoke of this as a very good and praiseworthy thing, seeing that RICARDO was one of the ablest Members that ever sat in that House. Now, as to RICARDO and his ability, Sir JAMES GRAHAM, BURDETT, BARING, DAVENPORT, and several others, have declared, that it was owing to the errors of RICARDO having been adopted by the Parliament, that PEEL'S BILL, and all its terrible ruin, were brought upon the country. RICARDO, the Chronicle told us, got half a million of money, by watching the turn of the market; but, RICARDO was a mere stock-dealer and loan-monger; he was a profoundly ignorant man; and the mischief which he did to this country was enormous. But the chief thing to observe upon here is,

that this little chattering chap, this colleague, or rather delegate, of the Don, finds out something to praise in the rotten boroughs: finds out that they are very good things: finds out, that they put excellent members into Parliament; most able and honourable men! And it was very well observed by PEEL, that "HOBHOUSE had furnished the most triumphant argument in favour of small boroughs!" The heart of the Member for WESTBURY seemed to warm towards the memory of RICARDO, who had been Member for the borough of PORTARLINGTON, and who, he said, was "a most able and enlightened and upright man"; to which he might have added, "just as I am, you see, my good friends, who am Member for Westbury"! In short, HOBHOUSE's speech, was a speech directly against reform; and PEEL very justly observed, "that he had reason to claim the Honourable Member for Westminster as a convert"! This remark of PEEL seems to have alarmed the little man, who said that "he denied that he advocated the continuance of small boroughs; all that he said was, that so long as the present system existed, he would wish them to continue"! Now, Gentlemen of Westminster, what is the meaning of these words! Why, it is this, that, until the present system of representation be destroyed, or wholly changed; until it be cut up, root and branch, he wishes it all to continue just as it is; he wishes nothing to be done at all: he has just this moment said, that he did not advocate the continuance of small boroughs; but, he will oppose the touching of them; he will not have one of them put down, by any means, until the whole of the system be changed! Mark, then, the sincerity of the fellow, who had said, but just before, "I am not prepared to refuse the most narrow and limited reform; I shall feel thankful for any thing that I can obtain;" and, after this, he says, that he will not touch the small boroughs, until the whole system be changed or swept away; and that he will oppose the motion of LORD BLANDFORD, "if it stop short of its getting rid of the small boroughs!" The truth is, that, having his eye upon the

DON; knowing how he felt upon the subject; seeing him march off, or seeing him vote against my LORD BLANDFORD's motion, the little fellow had his skiff to steer amidst rocks; and therefore, we are not to be surprised at the awkward exhibition: he seems to have anticipated the difficulties of the next election; he seems to have endeavoured to prepare himself for them; but, as the STANDARD has well observed, here is the speech in print, and to rub it out is not in his power. It is possible, that he has been misreported: if this be the case, let him come forth and tell us what he means: as far as this report goes, he stands clearly marked as an opponent to the MARQUIS OF BLANDFORD, and as an advocate for rotten boroughs; so that you, gentlemen, have at last the honour of being represented by one man who declares that he will vote against the putting down of rotten boroughs; and by another man, who, being in the House when the motion is coming on, either votes against all inquiry into the subject, or, goes away in order to avoid voting for it.

HOBHOUSE nibbles at the motives of the young Marquis. Does the Marquis begin as Burdett did? He began by visiting what he called "*the Bastille*," and by all sorts of exaggerations to inflame the most thoughtless part of the people. I remember, when his coaches, which carried his electors to BRENTFORD, had men on the tops of them *wearing chains*, which they rattled loud enough to stun people. Many of you remember, when he told you that you must "*tear the leaves out of the accursed Red-book*," and when the "*great families*," were the theme of his constant abuse. What were *his motives* then? Does the Marquis resort to tricks like these? But what prevented BURDETT from answering the Marquis, when the latter observed on the conduct of those "*patriots*" who had now abandoned the cause of *Reform*; and when he said, that we should now see who were the *declaimers* and who the *doers*? This was a thing for BURDETT to notice; but, he remained silent as a post. Silent, however, he cannot remain, if he live to see another

election for Westminster! But, in fact, BURDETT is pledged against *Reform*. He was the real author of the Irish Disfranchisement Bill. He was the inventor of it in 1825; and he and the vile WHIGS were the main supporters of it to the last. At a meeting of O'CONNELL's people in Ireland, held only the other day, O'CONNELL stated this fact: that, a meeting of the Catholics being assembled in London at the time when the bill was before the House, and their object being to petition against the Disfranchisement Bill, a meeting of WHIGS took place at the house of BURDETT, at the same time; and a message was sent from the latter to the former, begging them not to oppose the disfranchisement. O'CONNELL's words were as follows:—

"As to the Disfranchisement Bill, to remove any impression as to his participation in it, he wished to observe, that he was one of forty Catholic gentlemen who assembled in London to send forward a petition, and adopt such measures as might be calculated to resist the progress of the Bill; when they were on the eve of assembling, they received an intimation that there was a meeting of the Whigs in the house of Sir Francis Burdett, who considered that opposition to the Bill might have the effect of preventing Emancipation. The meeting, at which he was present, sent them word to oppose the freehold wing, although it might lose Emancipation." Add to this that BURDETT, as Mr. LAWLESS has declared in print, said that it was the rich that chose him for Westminster, and not the poor. Put these things together, think of these things, Electors of Westminster; and then, if you do not hold this man in reprobation, you yourselves merit the reprobation of all mankind. These words of O'CONNELL make part of a speech reported in the Dublin Morning Post of the 4th of June. This same O'CONNELL had the baseness, however, to praise this same BURDETT to the skies, in order to get the shouts, and to inhale the stinking breath of the hired ruffians assembled at the Crown and Anchor on the 25th of May. O'CONNELL himself, who was the first suggestor of the dis-

franchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders, is now going to have 5000*l.* of their money, wherewith to carry on an election, from the voting at which they will be excluded. There must be other set of men than these to come forward now, or the whole thing goes to pieces at a crash.

The situation of the country is not now such as to admit of his declamatory staff succeeding any longer. You, Gentlemen, fully partake in that general distress, which the whole nation now suffers, and which is all to be traced to the want of reform, which would have been obtained long ago, if he had done his duty, agreeably to his solemn pledges. The case is now this: that if there be not a reform of the House of Commons, there can be no adjustment of the money affairs; and if there be not, those who do not partake of the taxes must be ruined. The interest of the landowners, of the working people, and of all the tax-payers, is one and the same; and to this the interest of the tax-eaters, including the Jews, is directly opposed. As things now stand, the labouring classes, which contain the physical force, are alienated from the aristocracy. The former of these cannot be destroyed, but the latter may; and, indeed, by degrees the latter must, unless an important change speedily take place. If all the present measures be enforced for two years, no rents can be paid to the landowner. Of this I am as certain as that I am in existence. In 1822 numerous farms were thrown up and left without occupiers to avoid the demand for taxes and rates. What, then, is now to happen if these measures proceed? And why are they not to proceed, seeing that those who live on the taxes prosper in the exact proportion that the tax-payers decline. As these decline they become less and less powerful, and have less and less courage; and there is no reason why men in power and rolling in riches should show them any lenity. If the present measures be pursued, the progress will be this: people now in trade will be ruined; farmers now in business will be ruined; the landowners will get no rents; the taxes and rates will be paid; and the land will be cultivated, but the Government will supply the

place of the landowners. In gold at full weight these taxes never can be paid, and leave any thing for rent. The rent is the last thing that is paid: first the keep of the farmer and trader, including their indirect taxes; next the work-people, including their indirect taxes; next the direct taxes, and the poor-taxes; and next comes the rent. To collect the present amount of taxes in gold of full weight and fineness, and to leave any thing for rent is impossible. Of all persons, therefore, the landlords, and especially the nobility, are most deeply interested. The labouring classes must and will be fed and clad: the middle class will not be actually destroyed, because, though the present set will be broken up, another set will arise, fashioned to the new circumstances; but the landowners, who are that and nothing else, will be annihilated. And if any one ask me, why I think it possible that things should come to this pass, I ask, in my turn, why they should not come to this pass.

And how are the aristocracy to save themselves? In no way under heaven other than that of regaining the labouring classes, without whom they are no match for the Jews. Farms will be thrown up at first; but this will not continue long. The people must be fed, and especially the labouring people; and there must, in such case, be a law to authorize parish-officers to cause cultivation to be carried on. This was very nearly taking place in 1822: and, I repeat, that if the present measures be pursued, it must quite take place before the end of 1832. In 1822 manufacturers flourished; or, at least, they were not very much depressed; foreign commerce, also, was not in a bad state; but now, all are sinking together. The Duke of WELLINGTON says, that it is necessary to bring the people down to their habits of thirty-eight years ago; but, can he do this without bringing down the taxes to their amount of thirty-eight years ago? If he push the experiment to the extreme; nay, if he carry it on for six months longer, he will have before his eyes scenes that will astonish him. In short, an EQUITABLE ADJUSTMENT, or a CONVULSION, must be the result; and though, if the former be neglected, the

latter may approach *silently*, its final arrival is as *sure* as death is to the human body.

AN EQUITABLE ADJUSTMENT would put an end to the suffering and the danger; but this is not to be effected without *conciliating the people*; and they are to be conciliated only by giving them their undoubted right of choosing those who are to take from them their money, and to dispose of it; in short, it is to be done only by a real, a thorough, a radical reform of the House of Commons, the House of the Commons, or the Commons' or People's House of Parliament. I have a hundred times said, in print, that this reform would never take place until the paper-money and debt system had *brought things to an extremity*. To that extremity the affair is now *visibly* approaching: the duller eyes can now perceive its advance; the most besotted are now alarmed, if they have any thing to lose: the advance is with hasty steps; and even reform must, to be of use, come quickly. When the first lord CHATHAM said, that "if reform did not come from *within*, it would come from without *with a vengeance*," the people were a different people from what they are now: they have now, by degrees, been familiarized to things which their grandfathers would have died with shame but to think of. But, in spite of this, the people will not *lie down and die quietly by hundreds of thousands*: they, whatever they may be, will seek food and raiment; and, in the seeking of these, though in the most peaceable and humble manner, they, even without any design, will produce insensibly the natural result of such a progress.

Mr. THOMAS ATTWOOD has published his speech, made at Birmingham on the 8th of May, when he brought forward that petition, which has since been presented to Parliament. I would advise you, gentlemen, and every body else, to read this speech, which relates many things not known to every body; and which can leave in the mind of no man of sense a doubt, that convulsion must be the end of the present measures, unless prevented by a reform. In this speech Mr. ATTWOOD relates as follows: "I had occasion to ask a gentleman of

"*great talent and influence* to sign the requisition for calling this meeting together. He refused to sign it, saying 'to me, 'If you succeed in this requisition, you will *relieve the distress*. 'Let the distress go on. By so doing we shall *get reform*. And we shall bring *great criminals to judgment*.'" These words are well worthy of the attention of LORD BLANDFORD, and of every lord in the kingdom. Let the lords look well at these words. Let them consider, that it is not I, whom their base press calumniate; that it is not I, whom a scoundrel parson in SUFFOLK has the audacity to represent as the lowest and worst of mankind: let the lords, whose vile and ruffian press have thus treated me, consider, that it is not I, but Mr. ATTWOOD, who relates this fact; that Mr. ATTWOOD is not only a banker, in London as well as Country, but a man deeply interested in trade; and, he tells us, that it was a "*gentleman of great talent and influence*" whom he asked to sign his requisition, and who refused upon the above ground. "Let the distress go on. By so doing we shall *get reform*; and we shall bring *great criminals to judgment*." I would freely go from Barn-Elm to BIRMINGHAM to shake that gentleman by the hand; and there are thousands in London who would do the same thing.

This is precisely my view of the matter. I say, let the distress go on; by so doing we shall *get reform*; and we shall bring *great criminals to judgment*. I have proposed an EQUITABLE ADJUSTMENT: I know that there must be convulsion if there be not that; but, I also know, that we can have no EQUITABLE ADJUSTMENT without a Parliamentary Reform. No aristocracy was ever wise yet: they went on in France, till they were blown up and destroyed. They have had warnings enough, God knows, here. There lies on the table of the House of Commons the petition presented by Mr. Grey, now Earl Grey, declaring that a majority of the House was returned by 154 Peers and rich commoners; there is the printed report, showing, that, in 1808, members of the House itself received annually 178,994*l.* out of the public money, voted into their own pockets by themselves; or, at least,

put in
lations
there
while
is it
wards
I nee
mome
sulting
they h
I sh
becom
shoul
of the
begin
conci
the no
gener
of the
ceedi
weave
near
1st of
them
delive
at th
the C
weave
mone
as mu
a piec
up, u
ward
axe i
manu
never
Agric
estate
paye
be th
can r
ment
for th
of B
house
call
intrig
of M
sione
pres
those
in hi
base
whol
the
chan
bank

put into their pockets by laws and regulations which they themselves upheld; there lie these facts before us; and, while these facts are well known to us all is it possible that we must not feel towards the aristocracy in a manner that I need not describe? To the very last moment of their power they went on insulting the people of France. Verily, *they had their reward!*

I should be very happy to see them become wise before it be too late; I should be very happy to find this motion of the MARQUIS of BLANDFORD to be the beginning of a series of acts tending to conciliate the people. I recommend to the noble MARQUIS, and to his order in general, to read in the LEEDS PATRIOT of the 6th of June, the report of the proceedings of a meeting of the hand-loom weavers, held at ALMONDBURY BANK, near HUDDERSFIELD, on Monday, the 1st of June. I particularly recommend them to read the speeches of Mr. MANN, delivered at that meeting. The speeches at that meeting put those delivered in the *Collective* to shame. One of the weavers went through the history of the money concerns of the country with just as much ease as if he had been weaving a piece of cloth. In short, *the game is up*, unless the Aristocracy hasten forward and conciliate the people. The axe is laid to the root of all trade and manufactures: these *never will*, and *never can*, come back to what they were. Agriculture will and must go on, but the estates will be transferred from the taxpayers to the tax-receivers, unless there be that EQUITABLE ADJUSTMENT which can never be effected without a *Parliamentary Reform*. With this I conclude for the present, hoping that the MARQUIS of BLANDFORD, or some other resident householder of Westminster, will soon call you together, and, in spite of the intrigues of the DON and SANCHO, and of Michael Angelo's Street Commissioners, give you an opportunity of expressing a determination to abide by those principles which placed BURDETT in his seat, and to punish him for having basely abandoned those principles. The whole country is beginning to rouse itself; the master-manufacturers, the merchants, the ship-owners, nay, even the bankers, who were formerly enemies of

reform, are now for that very measure; for they can see no chance of escaping utter ruin, unless that measure be adopted. If REFORM come soon, convulsion will be avoided; if it grow out of *convulsion*, I would *rather be a chimney-sweep than a Lord*. If the aristocracy now join the people, now conciliate the people, all will be safe: their titles and estates will be safe: the ADJUSTMENT will be made; and the nation will speedily revive, and be once more able to look its foes in the face: but if this do not take place, the consequences will be such as I have all along anticipated, and such as I have a thousand times described.

I am, Gentlemen,
Your most faithful friend, and
most obedient servant,
WM. COBBETT.

CONVICTS' BANK.

THIS is a subject of everlasting fun. It seems that the pickpockets of Botany Bay have had a bank, or, at least, that there was a bank in the vile country to which they were sent, and to which fools are now about to emigrate. This bank has *stopped payment*, it seems, and has *thrown the whole settlement into confusion!* The newspapers are, I see, preparing to ascribe this breaking of the bank to *failures of crops*, or *some other than the real cause*. They never will speak of this matter in the language of truth and sense. They never will ascribe the mischiefs of paper-money to the paper-money: they all appear to have, some how or another, an innate affection for the false and villanous thing. For my part, I know that the breaking up of this thing in the convicts' country, has been, in part, if not in whole, caused by the suppression of the one-pound notes in this country. This measure has broken up scores and scores of the Rag Rooks in the United States of America, and a great many scores of fellows called *merchants*. No doubt the distress which is said to exist in France (but which would not be called by *that name* in this country) has arisen in part from the same cause. Money circulates throughout the world: if you destroy it entirely in one country, or fling it into

the sea or down into wells, money must come from other countries to supply its place; and, by taking it from other countries, you injure all debtors in those countries; you lessen the means of expenditure for a time; you lessen the demand for labour for a time; and, in all countries heavily taxed, you ruin the taxpayers. This measure, therefore, has reached the convicts and broken their bank. What the devil the convicts will do without their bank I cannot tell. The newspapers tell us that the colonists were in a state of great alarm, and that no one could calculate upon the evils that might result from the convulsion. It is only a year or two ago that many people at the Cape of Good Hope were ruined by *paper-money*. Wherever this accursed thing goes, it produces mischief. But, in the meanwhile, let people *take warning how they emigrate to these English Colonies*. In that of NEW SOUTH WALES, there are enormous taxes already, no less than 6s. 6d. on a gallon of rum, and 8s. 6d., on a gallon of other spirits, though these are the only drink of the country except water; while, in the United States, the price of common spirits is only about 1s. 6d. a gallon, including duty, and the price of French brandy only 3s. 6d., including duty. SWAN RIVER, with PEEL's blessing upon it, will soon have a *custom-house* and *tax-gatherers*! However, those who go thither, go duly forewarned; ruin will certainly alight upon them: complete ruin; but then, being willing slaves, ruin ought to be their lot. I shall get out my "EMIGRANT'S GUIDE" with all possible speed; for I am certain that it will save thousands upon thousands from ruin. I have received a good deal of intelligence recently from New York and other parts, which enables me to speak upon this subject greatly in detail. I know exactly what a man ought to do to lay out his money to the best advantage in settling in America. Let every father and mother of a family remember, that all those who remain here, and who receive none of the taxes, must be totally ruined, or greatly brought down in the scale of life. Let them remember, that the United States is *another England*, but where peaches ripen on standard trees like apples, where there are *no beggars*, and

where such a thing as a *pauper* is never seen; let English farmers remember, that a good farm of a hundred acres does not pay, in all the taxes put together, more than *ten or twelve dollars a year*; and a third part of those dollars go towards the supporting of a public school in the township: let them remember these things; and besides, that there are no *insolent parsons* and *no tithes*; and let them further remember, that the Congress has never attempted to pass a law to cause the dead bodies of unfortunate persons to be given up to be chopped to pieces by fellows called surgeons. If a man be fixed upon emigrating, I repeat, that the first thing he has to do is to sell his property; go quietly to work, and turn every thing into gold by degrees; and then, lodged in a cheap lodging, you have time to look about you. Take nothing to America excepting your wearing apparel. Goods of every sort are cheaper, and of most sorts are better, than they are here. You cannot, indeed, get any *lords* in America; so that if you must needs have some of them to crawl upon your bellies to, you must take them along with you, every thing else that is good for any thing is as abundant and far cheaper in America than it is here. But, in my little book, I shall give an exact account of *prices* of all sorts of things; except *archways*, perhaps, and some few others!

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

MANY thanks to a "STRANGER IN THE GALLERY," for his excellent letter, which shall appear next week. Thanks also for the letter from a Town Traveller, which is full of most useful information; and which ought, if it could be read by the Ministry, to produce a change of measures at once. No such thing will happen, however. These measures will go on, and I say, let them go on, and then we shall have REFORM, and we shall bring great criminals to judgment. Further communications from these two correspondents will always be acceptable.